THE

DOCTRINE

OF A

General Reſurrection:

WHEREIN

The *Identity* of the *Riſing Body* is aſſerted, againſt the *Socinians* and *Scepticks.*

IN A

SERMON,

PREACH'D

Before the UNIVERSITY, at St. *Mary's* in OXFORD, on *Eaſter-Monday*, Apr. 5.

BY

THO. BECONSALL, A.M. and Fellow of *Braſenoſe* College.

OXFORD:

Printed by *Leon. Lichfield*, for GEORGE WEST, Bookſeller, *An. Dom.* 1697.

THE PREFACE.

THE Biaſs of Humane Nature towards thoſe things we in any Sence call our *Own*, is ſo notorious and remarkable, that it often influences our Judgments in the Affairs of States and Kingdoms, no leſs than Families and private Perſons. But certainly there's a *Parental* kind of Affection exercis'd towards the Off-ſpring of our own *Minds*, as well as that of our *Bodies*, that often tranſports us into over-weening Fondneſſes, and unaccountable Partialities. Hence writing of Books, or publiſhing of Thoughts from the Cloſet, or Pulpit, is by the reſt of the World generally pronounc'd a piece of Affectation and Vanity, founded in an Opinion of ſome extraordinary intrinſick Worth or Merit. Men are not content to conceive and bring forth in a private Apartment, and view and admire

admire their own Productions; but height of Admiration ſends 'em forth into the open World, to exerciſe the ſame Faculties in others, no doubt with an Intention, that the Praiſes of all ſhould be return'd back on the Original. I muſt confeſs this is a Cenſure, which may ſometimes carry a great deal of Truth in it, tho' at laſt it ſeems to be a very *uncharitable* Truth; unleſs every *ſhort-ſighted Mortal* can pretend to be a Searcher of the *Heart and Reins*, or unleſs no Attempts of this kind could be acted by any other Motive, that is truly Juſt and Honourable. But however this Doctrine may prevail in common Caſes, certainly the ſpecial Obligations I'm unfortunately under, in doing Juſtice to my ſelf and others, will at this time free me from the Imputation of it. It has been more than once repreſented, how much I lie under the Diſpleaſure, not to ſay the Reproaches of ſome Men, for ſhamefully Miſ-repreſenting the Author of the *Eſſay concerning Humane Underſtanding*, for branding his Notions of *Identity*, with little leſs than the Imputation of Hereſy, whilſt at laſt I was forc'd to have recourſe to 'em, to eſtabliſh my own Hypotheſis: This is a Charge form'd on a tranſient Delivery of a Sermon,

and

and for the Truth of the greateſt part of it, I ſubmit it to every Ingenuous Reader, upon a View on both ſides.

But certainly it ſeems to reflect as much *Poſitiveneſs* and *Preſumption* on its *Authors*, as it induſtriouſly fixes *Folly* and *Diſgrace* on me. It might have been conſidered who preſides in the Univerſity-Church, to cenſure all ſuch *notorious Miſcarriages*, and conſequently they might at leaſt have expected a *Reprimand* from *Authority*, before ſuch a ſevere Sentence had paſſed upon me. This would have given them, not only an Opportunity to expreſs their *Reſentments* or *Indignation*, but added *weight* and *force* to 'em. As the Caſe ſtands, I'm not now to be a Judge; I can only declare, I'm as yet ſo unhappy to be wholly unſenſible of any *Miſrepreſentations*, and conſequently of any *Injuſtice* committed againſt Mr. *Lock*. And therefore being ſo highly charged, I thought the beſt Expedient to ſet both ſides to Rights, to put the one into a Condition of Vindicating himſelf, and the other of being Informed of an Errour, was to publiſh the whole Diſcourſe, which (as far as concerns Mr. *Lock*) I've done without the leaſt *Alterations*. Having ſaid thus much, give me leave

to

to offer ſomething by way of Pre-caution. I can ſafely declare, I am acted by no Perſonal Prejudices, no more than Unchriſtian Deſigns, for this Author is as abſolute a Stranger to me, as I am to him. The Subject I was engag'd on, directed me to the Controverſy, and the Duty I owe to what appears to me to be *Truth*, and eſpecially a *Fundamental Chriſtian Truth*, obliged me to enter the Liſt with thoſe that have advanc'd Poſitions, that apparently ſhake or over-turn it; and perhaps the Duty and Obligations are juſtly heightned in an Age, when the Aſſailment of the moſt important Articles of Faith is become ſo *exquiſitely Faſhionable*. But now, if in the Defenſe of *Truth*, it at laſt appears, that I have done this *Author* the leaſt *Injuſtice*, either in *miſ-repreſenting*, or *miſ-applying* his *Sence* or *Notions*, I ſhall heartily and freely make him *Satisfaction*, and that too as *publick*, as he or his Friends ſhall think fit to make my Miſtakes.

A Sermon, &c.

JOH. Chap. V. ver. 28, 29.

The hour is coming, in the which All that are in the graves ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come forth: They that have done good, unto the Reſurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.

THE preſent Solemnity has engaged me on a Subject, which as 'tis the ſupport and glory of the Juſt and Faithful, ſo it has always been the contempt and laughter of the Impious and Unbelieving. Its true, the Learned have often attempted to trace the Foot-ſteps of a general Reſurrection, from certain Reſemblances in the Book of Nature, or from certain Doctrines advanced (I know not how) in the Schools of Philoſophers. Thus the Earth hath been repreſented as a kind of Grave or Sepulchre to the Vegetable World, where the vital Powers are ſealed up, and ſtifled all the Winter, and yet at Spring are actuated, expand, and ſend forth a lively Verdure: Thus every Grain of Corn, that miniſters Life and Suſtenance to our own Species, muſt ſuffer Death, in order to receive a new vital Principle. Thus the Do-

 ctrine

ctrine of Tranſmigration, in the Schools of *Plato* and *Pythagoras*, has been ſought to, to ſpeak out that of the Reſurrection: And the Doctrine of a general Conflagration among the Stoicks, muſt uſher in the *Reſtitution of all things*. Theſe are Arguments, by no means the Product of any Modern Wits; but of the earlieſt *Apologiſts and Advocates for the Faith*. As if the Doctrine of the Reſurrection had been legible, in the very Frame and Conſtitution of Nature; and to deny it in the Old Schools of Philoſophy, were to renounce their own avowed Principles. But yet for all this its well known, the moſt powerful Aſſailants of the Chriſtian Faith, made their greateſt Efforts againſt this Chriſtian Bulwark. It did not become the ſubject of Drollery and Ridicule to the Stoicks at *Athens* alone, but it engaged the Wit and Malice too, of *Lucian* and *Celſus*, of *Julian* and *Cæcilius*. In a word, when it came to the Teſt, neither the moſt improved Doctrine of Tranſmigration, nor of the Soul's Immortality, nor of a future State, was ſufficient to introduce the Belief of it: For the whole Tribe of Gentile Philoſophers, tho' otherwiſe ſufficiently diſtinguiſh'd in their Notions and Principles, do here unanimouſly conſpire to pronounce it Abſurd and Impoſſible, and its Profeſſors, for this very reaſon, Vile and Deſpicable. In a word, Tho' the Doctrine of a Reſurrection, particularly that of the Juſt, had obtain'd in the Jewiſh Schools, except thoſe of the *Sadducees*, yet the Notion of it was vaſtly different from that Glorious Reſurrection, which the Chriſtian Inſtitutions ratify and eſtabliſh, for none of 'em could ever arrive to a ſtrict numerical Reſurrection; and therefore its in this ſence One of thoſe Doctrines, which ſtands to the *Jews* a *ſtumbling-block*, and to the *Greeks fooliſhneſs*. But notwithſtanding theſe extravagant Inſults, its to thoſe that believe, *The power of God, and the wiſdom of God*. Its a Doctrine as powerful in the Evidence of it, as it has been mighty in its Succeſſes; and tho' we cannot

aſſert

aſſert it from the eſtabliſhed Courſe of Nature, nor deſire to rake it up out of the Rubbiſh of Heathen, or Jewiſh Traditions, yet it reſts upon an unſhaken Foundation, even *a ſure word of Prophecy, unto which we ſhall do well to take heed*; for we have before us the words of Him, that is become *The Lord of Life and Glory, and has the Keys of Hell and Death:* He it is that aſſures us, *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come forth: They that have done good, unto the Reſurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.*

This famous Paſſage is almoſt univerſally allowed to be a Deſcription of a general Reſurrection. Indeed the Learned Biſhop *Pearſon* obſerves, that it ſtrikes ſo cloſely at the *Socinian* Notion of a Reſurrection, that ſome of 'em are forc'd to apply it to a Spiritual Reſurrection, and pronounce the Grave to be the Regions of Heathen Ignorance and Impiety, and the Reception of the Goſpel, to be the Reſurrection from 'em. But we muſt do *Socinus*, and the moſt conſiderable of his Followers, *Crellius* and *Schlictingius*, a piece of Juſtice here; for tho' they will not allow the words to prove the Identity of our Riſing Bodies, yet they reject the conceit of a ſpiritual Reſurrection, and aſſign the ſame Arguments againſt it, that are advanced by this Eminent Prelate. Since then we are thus far agreed, that the thing pointed at is a General Reſurrection, we may venture to affirm, that they inſtruct us in two important Circumſtances of it; *firſt*, the Extent, and *ſecondly*, the Manner of it.

Here's a diſtinction of Allotments, Life and Damnation, and they are founded in diſtinct Works and Actions, good and evil, and both imply diſtinct Claſſes of Perſons, the Righteous and the Wicked, and conſequently a Reſurrection of both: The Wicked muſt certainly bear a part in the Reſurrection, for every Soul that ſinneth, and every

Body that dyeth, and is committed to the Duſt, muſt riſe again: Yes, as ſurely as he dyeth and enjoys a Sepulchre, he muſt be forced from his Lodgment, and riſe again; for neither the *Grave*, *nor Rocks*, *nor Mountains ſhall cover*, much leſs ſecure him, ſince all that are in the Graves muſt come forth: Thus we have the Extent of the Reſurrection.

Again, If we demand with what Bodies ſhall we come? Why certainly ſince our Reſurrection is to be made from the Grave, and ſince our Bodies, even Fleſh and Blood were committed to the Grave, the very ſame Bodies will riſe again; the Subſtance will not be changed, tho' the Quality's altered: And thus we have the Manner of the Reſurrection, for *All that are in the Graves ſhall come forth.* I ſhall endeavour to aſſert both theſe important Truths, and that in Oppoſition to the Adverſaries of 'em.

I begin with the Firſt, I mean the Extent of the Reſurrection. As for the Extent of it, the *Socinian* Doctors are not yet agreed, tho' the moſt Judicious declare for a general Reſurrection. Its obſervable *Smalcius*, the Author of the *Racovian* Catechiſm, only deſcribes the Reſurrection of the Juſt, without taking the leaſt notice of that of the Wicked; whilſt others allow the former, but expreſly deny the latter. But an impartial Reader, one would think, could not have wiſhed for a clearer Deciſion of this matter, than our Saviour's words afford us, when we are told, *That all that are in the Graves ſhall come forth, part to the Reſurrection of Life, and part to the Reſurrection of Damnation.* So that he that diſputes the Truth of a general Reſurrection, muſt allow no diſtinction between the Righteous and the Wicked, no more than their future Allotments; or he muſt deny the Wicked the moſt common Office of Humanity, that of Burial, or excuſe it, by aſſerting an immediate Annihilation: For if the Wicked at the point of Death, do not immediately vaniſh into ſoft Air, or if Mankind do not uſually judge before-hand, and thereupon deny

'em

'em the Office of Burial, or if the Allotments of Life and Damnation are not indiſcriminately aſcertain'd (to affirm any of which would be a groſs and palpable Abſurdity) then the Wicked muſt come forth of their Graves, and make their Reſurrection, tho' a moſt Fatal one, even the Reſurrection of Damnation. We may add to this leading Authority another of St. *Paul's*, and its the more conſiderable, ſince this great Apoſtle induſtriouſly purſues our Saviour's Methods in Repreſenting it, and that too with reſpect to the Univerſality, Deſign and Manner of it: *For we muſt all appear* (no doubt from our Graves) *before the Judgment-ſeat of Chriſt, that every one may receive the things done in his Body* (no doubt in that very Body they were committed) *according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. But to conclude this Argument from expreſs Authorities of Scripture; the Divine Author of the Book of *Revelations* hath ſo accurately deſcribed a general Reſurrection, that he ſeems to have induſtriouſly Ranſackt all the Corners of the World, in order to advance a Challenge, to produce one ſingle Mortal, that has not his Summons to it. *And I ſaw the dead, both ſmall and great, ſtand before God* (no doubt with that very Part about 'em, for which they were once eſteem'd Dead-men) *and the Sea gave up the dead which were in it, and Death and Hell gave up the dead which were in them*, Chap. 20. ver. 12, 13. Here we ſee the Prince and Peaſant, the Infant and Man of Years, muſt obey the Summons of a general Reſurrection; and all the Repoſitories of Art and Nature, are forc'd to ſurrender up their Dead, or diſgorge the Mortal part of 'em: And will any *Socinian* pretend to contrive a ſhelter for the Wicked? I'm afraid he'll leave himſelf, as well as them, miſerably expos'd, eſpecially when the Text aſſures us, *That the very Heavens ſhall flee away, and there ſhall be no place found for them*, ver. 11.

But farther, not to reſt any longer in Generals, I ſhall endeavour to prove it from the Nature of the Thing, and that too in its particular Inſtances. And Firſt, As for the Reſurrection of the Juſt, its on all hands agreed, that they are virtually raiſed in Chriſt, for ſince the Head is riſen, and as ſuch ſtyled, *The firſt-born from the Dead*, the Members that are united to him, by a ſpiritual, vital Principle, his holy Spirit, ſhall certainly be raiſed, for *He that raiſed Chriſt from the dead, ſhall alſo quicken our mortal Bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us*, Rom. 8. 11. Again, Chriſt is expreſly ſtyl'd, *The firſt-fruits of our Reſurrection.* And as the Firſt-fruits offered to God, conſecrated, or bleſſed the whole Lump, ſo this *Firſt-fruit* having purchaſed to himſelf a vital Principle, by fulfilling the Divine Compact, it will be convey'd to all thoſe that have an intereſt in him; ſo that the Reſurrection of the Juſt, or Faithful, is in a ſpiritual Sence, or the way of Grace, derived from that of our Saviour, as abſolutely as Light or Warmth from the Sun, in the way of Nature. But then here's the Foundation of the Miſcarriages of our Adverſaries, the Rock which they careleſly ſplit upon: For ſince they are not able to diſcern any ſuch Connexion, between the Reſurrection of our Saviour, and that of the Wicked, they are apt to imagine, he can have no juſt Right or Title to it, and conſequently there's no real Foundation for it. But the Miſtake is extremely obvious: For as our bleſſed Saviour became a Mediator between God and Man, and this Mediation, in the original Deſign of it, extends to all the Sons and Daughters of *Adam*, he challenges an unqueſtionable Right of Dominion over the whole Species, upon the Performance or Execution of it; *For to this end Chriſt both died, and roſe, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*, Rom. 14. 9. This is ſo clear, that it extends even to Heathens and Unbelievers, for by virtue of it he becomes their proper Judge, and as he's their

Judge,

Judge, he can rightfully ſummon 'em from their very Graves, in their proper Bodies or Perſons. And therefore he hath an uncontroulable Authority to rouze even once the moſt potent Sinner, and oblige him to account for his Actions, with thoſe Eyes, and Hands, and Heart, that ſo groſly diſhonour'd him. And ſince in the diſtribution of Rewards and Puniſhments, he has ſignified a ſpecial regard to the Body, as well as Soul, we might without St. *Paul*'s expreſs Declaration conclude, *That there ſhall be a Reſurrection, both of the juſt and unjuſt*, Act. 24. 15. It is true, they move upon a different Foundation; the *firſt* is an Act of infinite Grace and Mercy, an Act that carries the moſt joyful Invitations in it, for its the glorious Conſummation of Chriſt's Eſpouſals with his Church; but the *ſecond*, an Act of ſovereign Power and Juſtice, and implies a kind of forcible Entry on the Tombs of the Wicked, who ſhall be haled forth, to receive the Sentence of Diſobedience in a perſonal and bodily Appearance. And thus much for the Extent of the Reſurrection.

I proceed to examine the Second General, which reſpects the Manner of it; and 'tis, *That we ſhall all be raiſed in our own proper Bodies:* And for the clearing of this Argument, I ſhall firſt evince it from the Nature of the Thing from Scripture, and Antiquity. And for as much as the Reſurrection of our own proper Bodies will appear from theſe Authorities, I ſhall in the Second Place, endeavour to ſtate the Nature of Humane *Identity*, and conſequently the Identity of our riſing Bodies; and from both theſe conclude what is proper to be Believ'd, and make ſome returns to the Poſſibility of ſuch a Reſurrection.

And Firſt, *That we ſhall All be raiſed in our own proper Bodies:* This is a Poſition which the Socinians unanimouſly reject; Its true, *Schlichtingius* places humane Identity purely in the Identity of a Rational Spiritual Soul; and tho' he doth not expreſly deny the Reſurrection of the Body, yet he

makes

makes the Identity of the Body no way material in the Reſurrection. *See Comment on Rom.* 8. *v.* 11. As for the Nature of humane Identity, I ſhall ſpeak to it in its proper place; and therefore I ſhall proſecute my preſent Deſign, and prove, that the Chriſtian Faith is, *We ſhall be raiſed every one in his own proper Body.*

And *firſt* this is indiſputably evident from the very Notion of a Reſurrection, and the receiv'd uſe of the Word. Now certainly a Reſurrection is the reſtoring a dead Creature to its former State of Life, by a Re-union of its firſt Principles. The conſtituent Principles of a Man are a Soul, and a Body, and Death primarily conſiſts in the Separation of 'em; or rather, as Death is the Fore-runner of Corruption, in the Diſſolution of one, or both of 'em: If therefore *Lazarus*, or any other Perſon is to be raiſed again, thoſe Two numerical Principles of which he was originally compounded, muſt be united; and then, and not till then, is *Lazarus* raiſed from the Dead. The Notion ſufficiently diſcovers it ſelf in the Caſe of *Lazarus*, and our Bleſſed Saviour; where the Body was not diſſolved, and the ſame is abſolutely required, where the corruptible Principle is actually diſſolved. Man is certainly compounded of a corruptible, and incorruptible Principle, the incorruptible Principle cannot ſuffer Death, or Diſſolution, and therefore Men are chiefly ſaid to be Dead, in reſpect of their corruptible Principle, that uſually ſuffers Corruption; certainly then if any particular Perſon is to be raiſed from the Dead, that Principle which properly dies, and is corrupted, is to be reſtored to its former State, and united to the incorruptible Principle, without which there can be no Reſurrection. For if the corruptible Principle, which properly dies, and is diſſolved, is not reſtored, but a new one formed, or created in the room of it, and united to the incorruptible Principle, it may be properly eſteemed a new Production, but

but by no means, a proper Reſurrection; and to aſſert the contrary, is to confound received Terms, as well as Notions. In a word, when a new Body is formed out of the common Maſs of Matter, and united to the Soul of any particular Perſon, its in reality no more but the *Pythagorean* Tranſmigration, which tho' perform'd after a new manner, yet by no greater a ſhare of Divine influence, than that which gives a plaſtick Power, to form a Body in the Womb, and unites a particular Soul to it. Shall the *Socinians* then, thoſe pretending Maſters of Reaſon, call this a Reſurrection? This is to obtrude a Notion contrary to the ſence of Mankind, when the great Argument for rejecting the true Reſurrection, is becauſe they cannot reconcile it to their ſcanty Meaſures of Reaſon. But that, what hath been hitherto aſſerted, was the true Notion of a Reſurrection, not only the Teſtimony of Scripture, and Chriſtian Antiquity, but the joint Suffrage of the Learned Heathens abundantly aſſures us: For it was on this account the Doctrine of the Reſurrection was loaded with ſo much Contempt and Scorn; when they conſidered ſo many various Tranſmigrations of Matter, they eſteemed it impoſſible for Omnipotence it ſelf, to range every Particle into its own peculiar Place and Order, ſo as to reſtore and make up every individual Body. Hence it was they triumphed in their Barbarities exercis'd upon ſome of the Martyrs of Chriſt, ſince they deſignedly committed 'em to the Jaws of wild Beaſts, to defeat (as they thought) Omnipotence, and infinite Truth at the ſame time, in diſabling him from performing what he had ſolemnly promiſed. Indeed had not the Reſurrection, in the moſt ſtrict and proper Sence of it, implied a Reſtitution of the ſame individual Body, it could not have extorted ſuch ſevere Cenſures from moſt of the Learned Heathens; for ſince they allowed the Immortality of the Soul, and a natural Tendency to aſſume a new Vehicle, they might eaſily al-

low, that Omnipotence could without any difficulty prepare a new Body, if that had been ſufficient, (as the *Socinian* would have it) to give it the Denomination of a Reſurrection. For in a word, This would have paſſed off as a ſpecious kind of Tranſmigration, and conſequently a Doctrine that would have met with a very eaſy Reception in moſt of the *Greek* Schools. But to proceed:

Let us in the next place examine what Scripture ſays to this Matter, whereby we ſhall prove our main Deſign, as well as confirm this very Notion. And firſt from the Paſſages already cited on another Argument, where the Reſurrection is ſaid to be made from the *Grave*, from the *Sea*, and *Hell*, and *Death*; where the *Dead* are ſaid to *ſtand before God*, and *Death and Hell* are ſaid to *give up their dead*. *See Rev.* 20: 12, 13. *Joh.* 5: 28. I think its indiſputably evident, the Holy Spirit directs us to the corruptible Principle, the Body, which alone ſuffers *Death*, and is committed to the *Grave*, and conſequently the Reſurrection muſt imply a Reſtitution of this very Principle, in Conjunction with the incorruptible Principle, the Soul. Indeed it ſeems abſurd, to ſend us to all the Repoſitories of the Dead, to eſtabliſh the Belief of a Reſurrection, if a new Corporeal Part is to be framed, or rather if the Mortal Part, that was laid in the Priſon of the Grave, is not to be given up again, and actually reſtored. The Argument is ſo obvious and convincing, that neither *Socinus* nor *Crellius*, upon theſe Paſſages of Scripture, are able to make any other Reply, but *Non ſequitur*, or it does not appear, that the riſing Body is the ſame numerical Body with that which fell. Its true, *Socinus* appeals to a Paſſage of St. *Paul*, which proves nothing (as will appear by and by) but what we freely grant, that our corruptible Bodies cannot inherit Incorruption. *See Comment. on Joh.* 5: 28. And therefore it concludes nothing againſt the preſent Argument.

But the Identity of our rising Bodies is evinced from yet more expreſs Authorities of Scripture; in one place we are aſſured, that the holy *Spirit ſhall quicken our mortal bodies*, Rom. 8. 11. In another, that our Saviour ſhall *change our vile bodies, that it may be faſhioned like unto his glorious body*, Phil. 3. 21. In a third, that *This corruptible ſhall put on incorruption*, 1 Cor. 15. 53. Here we have the Notion of a Reſurrection aſſerted in expreſs Terms, as well as the Identity of the riſing Body. For is it not that mortal corruptible Principle, or that Body which ſuffered Corruption in the Grave, that is ſaid to be quickened, or reſtored to Life? *Credlius* I know has the Face to affirm, that they are not our mortal Bodies, that are quickened, but new ones aſſigned us. [*See Comment on the Plate.*] But can a new Body, ſubſtituted in the room of my mortal Body, without Soleciſm and Nonſence, be called my mortal Body, or this *New Body quickened*, the quickning of my *mortal Body*? But to proceed, the remaining Paſſages carry the Abſurdity higher: Can a new Body, as to Matter or Subſtance, plac'd in the room of my corruptible Body, be fairly reconciled with *this Corruptible*? Or can my *corruptible Principle*, or dead Body, tho' never to be *reſtored*, be ſaid to put on *Incorruption*, only becauſe my Soul is after a certain Period united to *a new incorruptible Body, diametrically diſtinct from my corruptible Body*? *My Soul*, in ſuch a caſe, puts on *Incorruption*, but by no means my *corruptible Body*, that ſtill *rots* and *moulders* in the Duſt. Again, our vile Bodies may be *faſhioned*, or *changed* into *the likeneſs of Chriſt's glorious body*, by reducing 'em from a natural, to a ſpiritual, and from a corruptible, to an incorruptible Frame; but if perfect new Bodies are to be faſhioned and ſubſtituted, then *our vile bodies* are not the things *faſhioned or changed into the likeneſs of glorious bodies*, but *exchanged* for 'em. We therefore freely grant, that the Subſtance is *transform'd* by a *Change of Qualities*, from

natural to ſpiritual, and from corruptible to incorruptible Bodies: And this is all the Apoſtle intends, when he tells us, *That fleſh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of Heaven.* A great Truth no doubt, as it is encompaſſed with humane Infirmities, and corruptible Qualities; for the Cloſe of the Verſe gives us the ſence of the whole, *nor corruption inherit incorruption.* [1 Cor. 15. 35. *the place cited by Socinus.*] But now we have gone thus far, it would be highly abſurd to affirm, that a vile corruptible Body puts on *Incorruption*, or is faſhioned or changed into a *glorious Body*, when it remains in an eternal State of *Corruption.* Therefore the Reſurrection, which changes a vile and corruptible Body into a glorious and incorruptible one, muſt imply a Reſtitution of the corruptible Principle, and conſequently the ſame numerical Body is the undoubted Subject of the Reſurrection.

But farther, that I may not dwell too long on this General, I ſhall only have recourſe to Scripture for one Argument more; its *The Reſurrection of our Saviour's Body:* Now its well known, the Hiſtory of all the Evangeliſts, the Print of the Nails in his Hands and Feet, and of the Spear in his Side, demonſtrate, That our bleſſed Saviour roſe in that very *Body* which was Crucified, Dead and Buried; but now its on all hands agreed, that our Saviour was a Type and Pattern of our Reſurrection; yes, he's more to the Righteous, for its *Chriſt's the firſt-fruits, afterwards they that are Chriſt's at his coming.* The Apoſtle all along carries the Analogy between him and us, and therefore *As Chriſt roſe in his own proper mortal Body, ſo we ſhall all riſe in ours.* The *Socinians* are preſſed here, and therefore endeavour to evade the force of it, by pretending, That tho' our Saviour roſe in his Crucified Body, yet upon his *Aſcenſion* he received a *glorious* and *ſpiritualized Body.* But this Evaſion proves nothing, unleſs it appear from Scripture, that Chriſt *depoſited* his *Crucified Body*, and

aſſumed

aſſumed a new Body in the room of it. But this is a Conceit that's deſtitute of all Foundation from Scripture, and indeed ſo much, that I do not find any *Socinian* that peremptorily aſſerts it. Therefore this *Glorified Body* can be nothing but the *Crucified Body*, *refin'd*, *adorn'd* and *beautify'd*, and its no more but what we allow in the Reſurrection of our *vile mortal Bodies*, for they ſhall be faſhioned like unto his *glorious Body*: Therefore as Chriſt the *Firſt-fruits* is riſen in his own proper Body, ſo ſhall every one of us be raiſed in our own proper Bodies *at his coming*. Thus far it appears, that the current of Scripture, as well as the nature of the Thing, declares for the Identity of the Riſing Body.

But that we may confirm the one, and not be miſtaken in the Sence of the other, give me leave to reflect a little the Sentiments of the Primitive Church. And becauſe it would be impertinent in this place, to produce particular Paſſages of Authors, I ſhall only endeavour to repreſent this Argument in a few Obſervations. And firſt its evident, the Suffrage of the Primitive Church determined for the Reſurrection of the ſame Body; ſince the Belief of this very Article was the great Prop to the Conſtancy and Perſeverance of Martyrs and Confeſſors. Their very Perſecutors obſerv'd it in 'em, and they reſolutely atteſted the Power and Efficacy of it at the place of Martyrdom. They were perſwaded, that the very Hairs of their Head were all Number'd, and ſhould one Day be reſtored to 'em; and therefore they powerfully bore up under the Cruelties of their Executioners, tho' torn piece-meal by Racks and Saws, or devoured by wild Beaſts. Again, its well known, the grand Objection from the various Tranſmigrations of Matter, was in Being in the firſt Ages of the Church, and taken notice of on both ſides; and the Heathen Perſecutors (as was obſerved before) took care to improve it, by expoſing the Faithful to the Ravage of wild

wild Beasts. Its well known, the Fathers fix the Resurrection of the Body on the Justice of God, in the distribution of Rewards and Punishments. Its well known, they contended for the Resurrection of the Flesh, and expound most of the fore-cited Passages of Scripture, of that very Body and Flesh, that was committed to the Grave; nay, which is more than all this, the Style of most of the ancient Creeds was, *I believe the Resurrection of the Flesh.* And therefore since these are unquestionable Truths, we must conclude, that the Doctrine of a numerical Resurrection constantly prevail'd in the Primitive Church.

Give me leave to add but one word more. The Judgment of the Primitive Church, for a numerical Resurrection, is indisputably evident from the Censures that passed upon *Origen*; since we find him more than once condemned as Heretical, (sometimes by Councils) for asserting, that we shall make our Resurrection in an Æthereal Body, or rather that our rising Body is only formed from a seminal Principle of the corruptible Body. Upon the whole then it appears, that the Voice of Reason, Scripture and Antiquity, jointly declare for the Resurrection of the same Body, and therefore we have all the Authorities which a Matter of this Nature is capable of, that we are not mistaken in our Notions of it: Therefore we must not only believe, that we shall all be raised in our own Bodies, but *Earnestly contend for this Faith*, as originally *delivered to the Saints.*

And now since it is concluded, the Resurrection we are to make will be a Resurrection of the same Body, it remains that we *Enquire into the Nature of its Identity, or wherein this Sameness consists.* And that we take just Measures of the Identity of the rising Body, I think it will be necessary to offer something concerning the Nature of *Humane Identity*, or which is all one, the *Identity of a humane Person*, because the Identity of the *rising Man* will cer-

certainly be formed upon the ſame Rules and Principles with that of the *living Man*. And firſt, ſince Man, or which is the ſame thing, a *humane Perſon*, is certainly a Being compounded of Two diſtinct Principles, an *animal*, and a *ſpiritual Principle*, a *Soul*, and a *Body*; I cannot comply with a late *Reformer* of *Humane Underſtandings*, that places *Perſonal Identity* purely in *Conſciouſneſs*, or a Faculty of *Reflecting on our own Thoughts and Actions, and aſcribing 'em to our ſelves as ſuch*. I ſhall take liberty to conſider it, becauſe this Author ſpeaks of it only as applied to a humane Perſon, and expreſly applies it to the Reſurrection (no doubt) as an Expedient to ſolve the difficulties of it.

See Mr. Lock's Eſſay concerning *Humane Underſtanding*, Book 2. Chap. 27. Sect. 15. 20. 26.

Its true, for as much as Conſciouſneſs is an incommunicable Property of every intelligent Being, it will eaſily be granted, that there cannot be perſonal Identity without Conſciouſneſs; but we can by no means allow, that Conſciouſneſs is the ſole Principle, or Foundation of perſonal Identity, as this Author plainly aſſerts. Indeed he gives it ſuch an abſolute Sovereignty in this Affair, and diſcovers ſuch an over-weening Fondneſs for the Notion, *That the little Finger cut off from the Body, if Conſcious, muſt be the ſame Perſon*, Sect. 17. *That Conſciouſneſs inhabiting ſucceſſively ſeveral Bodies, muſt be all One and the ſame humane Perſon: That Two diſtinct Conſciouſneſſes acting in the ſame Body, one by Night and the other by Day, muſt make a Night-man and a Day-man, and Two diſtinct Perſons*, Sect. 22. In a word, he fairly ſuggeſts, *That Tranſmigration is a Doctrine no way abſurd, but very probable, and a good piece of Chriſtian Platoniſm*. And in plain terms, *That* Socrates *after this Life can no way be the ſame Man, but by Conſciouſneſs*, Sect. 20. Now certainly, as for the Doctrine of Tranſmigration, it will be readily allow'd to be a good Piece of *Platoniſm*, but he that owns himſelf an Advocate for it,

ren-

renders his *Chriſtianity* juſtly ſuſpected. For whoſoever admits the Reſurrection of the ſame Body, muſt pronounce Tranſmigration extravagantly abſurd; for certainly, if *Socrates*'s Soul has ſucceſſively inform'd, preſided, and acted in ſeveral Bodies, there will be as great a Conteſt at the Reſurrection, which Body ſhall be Married to *Socrates*'s Soul, as the *Sadduce* fooliſhly ſuppoſed, when he demanded *Whoſe Wife ſhall ſhe be of the Seven?* As for the *Identity* of *Socrates*'s Reſurrection, I hope to make it appear, that it does not conſiſt in *Conſciouſneſs*. But to return, *Perſonal Identity* can never conſiſt in Conſciouſneſs, tho' we take Perſon for an Intelligent Being, without any regard to any particular *Subſtance* wherein it exiſts; ſince it is only a *reflex Act*, or *Faculty* of an *Intelligent Being*, and ſuppoſes ſeveral Faculties antecedent to it, whereas the Identity of any Being muſt ariſe from the firſt Principles of its Exiſtence. But now its evident, *Perſon* implies an *Intelligent* Being, with regard to the *particular Subſtance*, and the Parts and Principles of it, whereby it exiſts; for otherwiſe I would fain know, how its poſſible to diſtinguiſh a *Humane*, an *Angelick*, and a *Divine Perſon*. Mr. *Lock* will reply, That they are only to be diſtinguiſht by *diſtinct Principles of Conſciouſneſs*; but thus far every *particular* Humane Perſon is diſtinguiſht; and conſequently there muſt be ſomething elſe than *Conſciouſneſs*, to diſtinguiſh the ſeveral *ſpecies* of Perſons. I am ſure an *Angelick*, and *Humane* Perſon muſt be diſtinguiſht by *diverſity* of *ſubſtance*, as well as *Conſciouſneſs*, in as much as the one is a *pure Spirit*, the other a Subſtance compounded of *Spirit* and *Matter*, or an *animal* and *ſpiritual* Part. Theſe are Poſitions that anſwer to the moſt uncontroverted Idea's or Notions of a humane Perſon. But now if a humane Perſon, in the true Notion of it, implies an Exiſtence of the animal, as well as the immaterial or ſpiritual Part, the Identity of a humane Perſon, or which is the ſame thing, Perſonal Identity,

tity, as apply'd to a particular Man, muſt conſiſt in the *Identity* of the *animal*, as well as *immaterial* Part, wherein-ſoever that happens to conſiſt; and conſequently Conſciouſneſs, which is only a Property of an immaterial Soul, and in the Judgment of Mr. *Lock*, may be Communicated to any new Body, or animal Part, cannot reach the Identity of a humane Perſon. In one word, I dare appeal to all the world, Whether Mr. *Lock*, throughout his whole Chapter of *Identity*, doth not ſpeak of *perſonal Identity*, as apply'd to a *humane Perſon*; and certainly Conſciouſneſs, which may exiſt with the Soul in a ſtate of *Separation*, can never be the *adequate Principle* of perſonal Identity, unleſs we can imagine, that the Body contributes nothing to the making up of a *humane Perſon*; or indeed, that it is not an eſſential Principle as well as the Soul. I am ſure ſuch Notions, ſuch Aſſertions as theſe, would have done ſignal ſervice to the Sect called Δοκηται, that reſolv'd our Saviour's humane Nature into mere *Phantaſm*; for if Conſciouſneſs is alone ſufficient to conſtitute the Identity of a humane Perſon, or if the animal Part of a humane Perſon is not an Eſſential, as well as the Soul, it was unpardonable Injuſtice in the Primitive Church, to pronounce this Set of Men *Hereticks*. I remember Mr. *Lock* very learnedly aſſures us, that Perſon is a *forenſick Term*, apply'd to a Being capable of *judicial Puniſhment*, as well as *Rewards*: But certainly ſuch a Perſon, in the Judgment of the Bench, contains an animal Part in the Idea of it, as well as Conſciouſneſs; elſe the Perſon may be conſcious of a Thouſand Crimes, and ſtand Convicted too, and yet defy the Judicial Power in inflicting perſonal Puniſhments. But to conclude this Argument in a few words, if Conſciouſneſs is the ſole Principle of perſonal Identity, ſuppoſe we ſhould find it, at the general Reſurrection, United to a *little Finger*, to an *Indian Tortoiſe*, or a Body made up of the Remains of *Heliogabalus*'s *Hogs*, (Inſtances of his own culling) it

may be the very ingenious Author of the *Eſſay concerning Humane Underſtanding* Riſen from the Dead, or the very ſame numerical Perſon he was in the Land of the Living. I am ſure all this literally agrees with his own Language, when he tells us, *Sect.* 26. in the Name of an Apoſtle, *That at the great Day every One will be the ſame by Conſciouſneſs, in whatever Bodies they ſhall appear, or Conſciouſneſs adheres to.* If therefore he'll be content to make his Reſurrection on theſe Terms, I leave him to enjoy his beloved Notion, ſo that he'll allow others to expect a Reſurrection according to the Catholick Faith. And now I am ready to accuſe my ſelf, for dwelling ſo long upon a ſingle Notion: But yet I think it was abſolutely neceſſary to my preſent Undertaking, which is to ſtate the Nature of humane Identity, or which is the ſame thing, perſonal Identity, as apply'd to a humane Perſon, to aſſert the Catholick Doctrine of the ſame Riſing Body; and in a word, to reſcue it from downright *Socinianiſm* in a new Dreſs.

For what is all this but to act the *Socinian* in *Maſquerade*, or under the Diſguiſe of new *Names*, rather than *Notions*; for if Conſciouſneſs alone conſtitutes the Identity of the riſing Perſon, what doth it differ from the *Socinian Notion*, that places the Identity of a humane Perſon in the ſame *Individual Spirit*, and allows the riſing Body to be formed of *common Matter*. I ſhall not peremptorily affirm, that this is a Notion which deſerves the Name of *Hereſy*; but certainly, if *Origen*'s Notion of an *Æthereal Body*, or a *Seminal Principle*, was juſtly condemned as *Heretical*, I am ſure it muſt be a ſignal Favour to exempt Conſciouſneſs thus apply'd, from as ſevere a Cenſure. Thus we ſee the wonderful Product of free Thinking, when it acts without the leaſt regard to the Canon of Scripture.

But to return to the Deciſion of the Nature of Humane Identity: As for the ſpiritual Principle, the Soul, tho' it doth by no means conſiſt in Conſciouſneſs, yet its abundantly

dantly concluded, it conſiſts in the ſame individual intelligent Spirit. The remaining Difficulty then is to fix the Identity of the *Animal Part*, the *Body*; and certainly the Identity of the animal Part muſt in one word conſiſt *In a fit Conſtruction and Organization of certain Particles of Matter, whereby one common Principle of Life is begun, continued, and the Integral Parts of the Man are perfected and maintained.* If it be demanded, Which are the Integral Parts of a Man, certainly they are either to be meaſured by this common Principle of Life, as they are more or leſs ſerviceable to the Maintainance of it, or at leaſt from the received Idea of the animal Part. Under the firſt Head are to be reduc'd the Veſſels and Inſtruments of Concoction, and the Elaboratories of the Blood and Spirits, or Vehicles of Life, ſuch are Nerves, Veins and Arteries. Under the ſecond are the Skin, Fleſh, Bones, and their Appendages, and even Shape and Proportion; for tho' as to Bones and Fleſh, there may be no expreſs Standard, with reſpect to Weight, Dimenſion, or Number, no more than in Nerves or Arteries, yet its impoſſible to make up the Idea of the animal Part of a Man, without ſomething of each of theſe; for we can no more conceive a humane Body, without Fleſh and Bones, than without Life: *Feel, for a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones, as ye ſee me have*, and the ſame is to be ſaid of Figure and Proportion, ſince it would be abſurd to pronounce a *Tortoiſe*, or a *little Finger*, the animal Part of a Man, or humane Perſon. This is a Truth ſo indiſputable, that were the Body of the *Author of the Eſſay of Humane Underſtanding*, transform'd into a *Tortoiſe*, or *little Finger*, and Conſciouſneſs joined to it, I'm perſwaded he would ſcarce think himſelf the ſame humane Perſon, unleſs it was done when his Brain was exceedingly warm'd with this *uncouth Notion*. Again, as to thoſe fleeting Particles, whether vital Spirits, or other more ſubtle Parts, that are carried off by more nice and delicate ſorts of

Evacuation, tho' we cannot eſteem 'em integral, conſtituent Parts of a Man, becauſe humane Identity is not deſtroy'd by the loſs of 'em, yet they are juſtly to be eſteemed proper *Appendages* of every particular Man; inaſmuch as during their abode in the Body, they were inſtrumental to the carrying on of Life and Action, and often miniſtred to a Man's Vices, as well as Virtues.

And now having fixt the Identity of the Animal Part, in this Life, together with its Integral Parts and Appendages, it will be eaſy to determine wherein the Identity of the riſing Body, and conſequently of the whole Man conſiſts, and how it may be preſerved.

And, *firſt*, I think we are not obliged to proceed upon the *Ariſtotelian* Principles of Generation and Corruption, which pronounce every little Tranſmutation of Matter, a total Deſtruction of the *Individual*, and tho' the ſame Particles are re-collected and formed into a Being of the ſame Model, yet make it to be a new Individual. With ſubmiſſion then, the moſt direct Method to aſſert the Identity of the riſing Body, is to reſolve it into its firſt Principles, *Duſt, for duſt we are, and unto duſt muſt we return*; and certainly *Duſt* muſt be the Materials of the riſing Body. If therefore there are ſufficient Materials of this kind left in the Chambers of Nature for each reſpective Body, its the ſpecial Buſineſs of Omnipotence to form 'em into the integral Parts of a humane Body, and in this Sence, *Give to every ſeed its own body.* But as for the Original of this Stock of Matter, I do not think it neceſſary, that *Socrates*'s *riſing Body* ſhould be wholly compounded (as ſome would have it) of thoſe Particles which are the remains of *Socrates*'s *dead Body*, for its certainly ſufficient, if to theſe a ſupply be called in from any evaporated Particles, that were once *real Appendages* of *Socrates*'s *living Body.*

Secondly, It cannot be ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Identity of *Socrates*'s riſing Body, if it only enjoys ſo many Particles of his animal, or dying Body, as ſerve to make up the Bones and principal Veſſels, and the reſt (as others contend) by a plaſtick Power, or ſeminal Principle, made up from *forreign adventitious Matter*. In a word then, I think its abſolutely neceſſary, that all the neceſſary *integral* Parts of *Socrates*'s *riſing Body*, even Fleſh and Blood, ſhould be made up of the Particles of *Socrates*'s *dying Body*, or at leaſt of thoſe *evaporated* ones of his *living Body*; and and when Subſtance, Life, Lineaments, and the Proportion of a humane Body are formed out of the aforeſaid Maſs of Matter, God may add what Embeliſhments he pleaſes from the ſtock of *common Matter*, and yet *Socrates*'s Body is undoubtedly raiſed, and when the individual Soul or Spirit of *Socrates* is united to this *riſing Body*, *Socrates* is certainly raiſed the *ſame Man*, and the *ſame Perſon* he was in the *Land of the Living*. And thus much for the Nature of humane Identity, as well in the Reſurrection, as before it.

From hence we may, in a few words, diſcover what is fit to be believed concerning the Reſurrection of the Body, and remove the Sceptick's mighty Objection advanc'd againſt it.

And as to the firſt, I think we may leave the School-men ſweating in the midſt of Objections and Anſwers, about *Hairs and Nails*, the *State of Infants*, and *Adam*'s *Rib* too, for I do not think it Matter of Faith to determine, whether Children ſhall riſe grown Men, or whether we are to enjoy the ſame Number of Ribs, Nails, or Hair, or whether they ſhall be compounded of forreign Matter, or no. We may in general conclude, that it ſeems moſt agreable to the infinite Wiſdom of God, to reſtore at leaſt the *Elect*, or *Bleſſed*, in the utmoſt Perfections of humane Nature.

But Secondly, From the Premiſes it may juſtly be preſum'd purſuant to the ancient Faith, that we are to believe

the

the *Reſurrection of the Fleſh*; for tho' no certain quantity or proportion can be preſcribed, yet Man was originally Created in *Fleſh* and *Blood*, and its to be eſteem'd as much an integral Part, as *Nerves* and *Arteries*, and conſequently an *Identity* is to be obſerved in this, as well as in other Caſes. I know there are Two Paſſages in St. *Paul*'s famous Diſcourſe on the Reſurrection, which ſeem to interfere with it; where we are told, that *Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, and the Body is ſaid to be *ſown a natural body*, but *raiſed a ſpiritual body*. The firſt of theſe hath been in ſome meaſure reply'd to, and the ſecond is certainly to be expounded the ſame way; *Its ſown a natural body*, ψυχικὸν, or an *animal body*, or a Body that is to be ſupported by Food, Sleep and Warmth, and carries the Seeds of *Corruption* in it; but its rais'd a *ſpiritual body*, refin'd, or freed from its corruptible Qualities, or from that continued Flux of Parts, whence the Imperfections and Infirmities of an animal Body are derived; or again, its not a Body of that groſs Allay, which our animal Bodies were Created in, ſince its Parts will be wonderfully attenuated, refin'd and ſpiritualiz'd, and in a word, faſhioned after the manner of a *glorified Body*. So that here ſeems to be no Foundation to reject the Reſurrection of the Fleſh; I'm ſure it cannot be that of *Corruption*, for that Almighty Arm, that raiſes the Body out of the Duſt, can by the ſame Act, render *Fleſh and Blood incorruptible*, as well as the moſt refin'd Particles of Matter. And thus much for what is proper to be believed.

In the laſt place we come to make a return to the *Sceptick*. Does he with Triumph, and a ſcoffing Infidelity demand, *How can theſe things be*, after ſuch repeated Tranſmigrations of Matter? The Reply is eaſy, when we have demanded what he can by no means reject: And Firſt, Will he allow that the evaporated Particles of the living

living Body, as well as thoſe of the dying Body, may be fit Materials for the riſing Body? Will he allow the received Doctrine of Nutrition, that ſcarce the Fiftieth Part of what is eaten, turns to real Nouriſhment, or is aſſimilated and conſubſtantiated with the ſeveral parts of the feeding Body, ſo that the reſt is caſt forth into the *Draught*, or *common ſtock of Matter*? Will he allow, that the principal parts of thoſe Bodies that are expos'd to the Mouths of wild Beaſts, ſuch as Bones, Ligatures, Cartilages, and almoſt the whole Genus of Veſſels, are very unfit Materials for Food; will he allow, that the devouring Animal may live ſo long, as to diſgorge moſt of his Prey, I ſay, to diſgorge by inſenſible Evacuations moſt of thoſe Particles that turn'd to real Nouriſhment? Will he allow, that the Parts of the *glorified Body* may be attenuated to that degree, that half the Matter which made up the *Animal Body*, may ſerve to give it all the Features, Lineaments and Proportions of a humane Body? Laſtly, When Infidelity induſtriouſly expoſes the Bodies of his Saints to Ravage or Spoil, to defeat the Engagements of the *Almighty*, will he allow that this *All-wiſe All-powerful Being* may for that time invert the Courſe of Nature, and ſend forth the greateſt part of that Matter, which would otherwiſe have turn'd to Nouriſhment? Theſe are all Conceſſions, which the original Notices of a God, and the common Principles of Philoſophy, will warrant and confirm. But now ſince all theſe muſt be allowed, tho' the moſt avowed *Sceptick*, or *Infidel* turn *Tyrant* and *Devil* too, and exert his utmoſt Wit and Malice, in defeating the Deſigns of the Almighty; in a word, tho' he out-do the moſt improved Cruelties of former Perſecutors, and tear Infants from the Womb, to ſacrifice to Wolves and Tygers; yet after Wit and Malice, and Cruelty have ſpent themſelves, there will ſtill be Materials enough for Omnipotence to perfect his own Deſigns, in a *glorious* and *triumphant Reſurrection*.

And

And thus I have in ſome meaſure performed what I at firſt engaged in. But certainly this is a very vile way of Practiſing upon our Faith; Suppoſe we were not able to form any manner of an *Hypotheſis*, to repreſent the Poſſibility of a *General Reſurrection*, muſt the cleareſt Revelations be rejected, and the Fact pronounced impoſſible, becauſe we are not able to form a *Modus*, to demonſtrate the Poſſibility of it. Certainly this is to meaſure Omnipotence, by the ſhallow Projections of a finite Underſtanding. But before any Man pretends to fix Impoſſibilities upon reveal'd Matters of Fact, he muſt be able to give an exact Account of the various Modes, by which its impoſſible for on *All-wiſe* and an *All-powerful God*, to execute and perform 'em. Till this is done, to pronounce any thing of this Nature impoſſible, is the heighth of Impudence, Folly and Preſumption; And ſhall any Man pretend to trace the different Workings of *Omnipotence*, when he's baffled in every little *Phænomenon* in natural Cauſes; a finite Underſtanding is not able to comprehend the one, and nothing leſs than Knowledge, as extenſive as infinite Power, is able to fathom or unravel the other. Let no Man then be Bubled out of his Faith, by ſuch extravagant Pretences: But let him conſider, that *God who comprehends the duſt of the Earth in a meaſure, and weigheth the mountains in ſcales, and the hills in a ballance*, can not only Marſhal together, all the diſperſed Particles of each reſpective Body, but reſerve ſuch a Stock of each in the Chambers of Nature, as will enable him to anſwer, and make good his Promiſes. And ſince he has plainly aſſured us, that we ſhall All riſe in our Bodies, let not any ſeeming Difficulties ſhake our Faith, but rather let his infinite Power and Wiſdom anſwer and remove them; for we may be ſure of this, that his infinite Power and Wiſdom will conſpire to aſſert his Veracity. In a word, It ought to be conſidered, that the ſacred Canon expreſly place's the

the Article of a general Reſurrection upon the *Infinite Power of God*; and therefore tho' the Doctrine of future *Rewards* and *Puniſhments*, may not diſcover the neceſſity of the ſame riſing Body, yet in as much as it reſolves it ſelf into the *Infinite Power of God*, it ought to be looked upon as a ſpecial *Atteſtation* of the *Divine Authority* of the *Goſpel Inſtitution:* And conſequently we may conclude, that *God* will find out Methods to accompliſh his own Deſigns, ſo that neither the Power of *Hell*, *Death*, nor the *Grave* ſhall be able to baffle and defeat 'em. And then we need not fear, but *God will give to every Seed his own Body*, and in the ſame act, change our *vile Bodies, that they may be faſhioned like unto his glorious Body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to ſubdue all things to himſelf.*

A Poſtſcript.

SInce the Compoſure of this Diſcourſe, there's an Attempt made to over-turn the Numerical Identity of the Riſing Body: [*See Latitudinarius Orthodoxus, de Myſterio Reſurrectionis*, Cap. 7. Sect. 3.] And tho' a great deal is offered ——— from the Juſtice and Wiſdom of God, yet I think there's nothing conſiderable, beſides the Argument drawn from the Inſtance of *Seed or Grain*, given by St. *Paul* upon the Subject; and becauſe it ſeems to claſh with the Hypotheſis I have advanc'd, I think my ſelf obliged to make ſome Return to it. The words are theſe: *But ſome man will ſay, How are the dead raiſed up? and with what Body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou ſoweſt is not quickned except it die? And that which thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not that body that ſhall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of ſome other grain: But God giveth it a body as it hath pleaſed him, and to every ſeed his own body*, 1 Cor. 15. ver. 35, 36, 37, 38. Upon the words we may very juſtly premiſe, that the Apoſtle argues by way of Alluſion and Example, and therefore the Parallel is to be carried no farther than the Deſign and Scope of the Apoſtle's Argument; for when Inſtances come up to the main Deſign of an Argument, tho' in other Caſes there's an apparent Diſparity, they have ſerv'd the Intention of 'em, and to extend 'em farther is *Illogical* and *Unjuſt*. Again, there can be no force in *Alluding Inſtances*, when apply'd beyond their primitive Deſign,

Deſign, if the Application is inconſiſtent with other expreſs *Poſitions of Scripture.* This is a Limitation ſo juſt and reaſonable, that where any Doctrine is expreſs and clear, its to be a *Rule* or *Interpretation* to any Alluſion that ſeems to interfere with it; eſpecially as long as the Interpretation concludes any thing, and is not *forced* and *unnatural.* This I offer, becauſe I hope I have produc'd expreſs *Authorities* of *Scripture,* which prove the numerical Identity of the Riſing Body, beyond all diſpute or controul: But now for the Apoſtle's deſign, I think its only to repreſent the Nature of that Change, which is to be made on our mortal Bodies at the Reſurrection: *How are the Dead,* or how is the Mortal Part of 'em *Raiſed up? With what Bodies do they come?* How ſhall theſe mortal Bodies be chang'd, alter'd, or model'd? The Inſtances repreſent a a Change, but its only in *Qualities* and *Perfections,* not in *Matter* or *Subſtance*; this is apparent from the whole Catalogue of Inſtances, which ought to be uniform and conſiſtent.

As one ſort of Fleſh differs from another ſort of Fleſh in Frame and Contexture, and conſequently in Qualities and Diſpoſitions; ſo doth the riſing Body differ from the mortal Body, as the Glory of the Sun, Moon and Stars is vaſtly different, ſo is the Glory and Perfections of the riſing Body from thoſe of the mortal Body; and the leading Inſtance is apparently ſubject to the ſame Application. The Seed ſown, *viz.* of *Wheat, or ſome other Grain,* is ſenſibly different from the Product of it: The firſt is but bare Grain, the ſecond Grain with Root, Blade and Ear to it; and no doubt the difference between the Riſing and Mortal Body is as viſible, as to its Frame and Qualities, for its God that models our mortal Bodies, or *gives them Bodies as it hath pleaſed him.* And its plain, the Parallel is deſign'd thus far, and no farther, for thus it is expreſly apply'd: *So alſo is the Reſurrection of the dead. It is ſown in corruption, it is raiſed in incorruption:*

ruption, it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. Here's indeed a very considerable Change, but its a change of the same Body, and consequently a change of Contexture, Quality, or Disposition, not a change of Matter and Substance; and therefore its absurd to carry the Parallel any farther: For tho' the Production of Corn supposes only a seminal Principle in the Seed, whilst the greatest share of Matter is adventitious, and only prepared by proper Vessels; yet it can be no Argument that our rising Bodies are to be made up of adventitious Matter, unless it were expressly apply'd thus far: Besides, this Instance of Seed can be carried no farther, than those of the *Sun, Moon and Stars, and the different kinds of Flesh*; and as these cannot, without Absurdity and Nonsence, be apply'd to represent any thing, but the different Qualities and Perfections of the rising Body; so that of Seed cannot, by the Rules of Logick, or right Reason, extend any farther.

Upon the whole then, the Identity of the Rising Body is established on the cleareſt Authorities of Scripture, and there's nothing in the Argument before us, that can be thought to invalidate, or weaken the force of 'em: The refore what is before asserted, concerning the Identity of the Rising Body, is still in force, and may be esteem'd consonant to the Canon of Scripture, and the Catholick Faith.

FINIS.